DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 988 PS 025 571

AUTHOR Oberman, Ida
TITLE The Mystery of Waldorf: A Turn-of-the-Century German Experiment on Today's American Soil.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Educational Innovation; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Nontraditional Education; Teacher Collaboration
IDENTIFIERS Germany; Historical Background; *Waldorf Educational Theory; Waldorf Schools

ABSTRACT

At its inception, Waldorf education was not to be a special, "boutique" reform. Nor was it to cater to children of a higher social standing. In fact, Waldorf broke out of the hierarchically tracked education system present in turn-of-the-century Germany. The founding father, Rudolf Steiner, called for a "Volks" pedagogy, a schooling of the people for the people that bridged separate castes that had been hardened by emerging industrialization. This paper attempts to answer why this educational reform has such staying power, but also why informed educators now associate Waldorf with a "special education for special children"-special because they were to enjoy a human or "holistic education of the body, mind, and soul." The paper provides a discussion of the movement's founding in a tobacco factory in 1919, describing its "social pedagogy" and the intimate connection made between imagination and social interaction. Good education, in Waldorf philosophy, restores the balance between thinking, willing, and feeling, thus healing the social fabric upset by too much emphasis on thinking alone. The paper argues that the secret of Waldorf's time-resistant identity can be found in its foundation as a "free" school--free from external government constraints and free for imaginative and innovative faculty interaction; the establishment of Waldorf as a faculty-run institution was sharply different from existing models of reform. The paper also touches on three liabilities of the Waldorf philosophy: first, the binding of the "free" pedagogy with time-bound preconceptions of early twentieth century Germany; second, the original German curricular canon, with its nineteenth century definitions of culture; and third--specific to the United States-the translation of "freedom from the Prussian state' into the voucher-based drive for "freedom from the community." Contains 54 references. (EV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 409 988

THE MYSTERY OF WALDORF:

A turn-of-the-century German experiment on today's American soil.

Ida Oberman

Stanford University

PS 025571

Paper presented at the American Education Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

March 1997

ioberman@stanford.edu
Center for Research on the Context of Teaching
Ceras, Rm 402
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ida Oberman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When I asked last year's AERA distinguished speaker Michelle Fine how she looked at "Waldorf," her answer was clear and succinct: a "special philosophy for special children." Ironically, she then proceeded to give a riveting talk on "Imagination and social action," at once the vehicle and goal of Waldorf education.[1] At its inception, Waldorf was not to be a special, "boutique" reform. Nor was it to cater to "special" children. In fact, Waldorf broke out of the hierarchically tracked education system that held turn-of-the-century Germany in its grip. The founding father, Rudolf Steiner,[2] called for a "Volks" pedagogy, a schooling of the people for the people: bridging separate castes, hardened by the emerging industrialization.[3]

The most intriguing question this morning is: why did this vision not fade away? What gave this century-old reform such staying power that it is on our program today? But also: how to explain that informed educators associate Waldorf with a "special education for special children?" To get to the bottom of these questions, I take you back to a day in spring, April 23, 1919, and to the floor of the Waldorf Astoria Cigarette Factory in Stuttgart. Then and there Waldorf was born.

Some 600 workers, mostly women and girls, were surrounded by piles of tobacco, the youngest sitting on top of the packed bales. It was the end of another long factory day. All workers had been asked to stay and listen to Rudolf Steiner, the already renowned social reformer and friend of the factory owner, Emil Molt . Thus

---

[1] Fine:1996.
[2] 1861 - 1925.
[3] Steiner, GA 192; 1994/1919.

Steiner made his first entry into the Waldorf setting.[4]

His start was awkward. He spoke analytically and abstractly about the disastrous development of man in the western world and about the need for a unifying vision of society. The audience took in Steiner's words with "palpable reserve," as one acute observer noted.[5] Just as he was about to lose his audience completely, Steiner started to connect: "All of you here -- from the 16-year-old apprentice to the 60-year-old worker-- all of you are losing out because you only receive job instruction instead of 'human education'."[6] All at once he had his audience's ear as the listeners began to latch on to the common vision of comprehensive human growth. The first hesitant responses grew into one collective request: "Do something for our children so that they can receive a better foundation for life!" [7] The cigarette makers were not interested in a theoretical social order, but they cared deeply about a better future for their children. This was Waldorf's umbilical cord. [8]

In his later memoirs the factory owner Molt referred to this day as Waldorf's birthday.[9] And indeed, the factory floor was the cradle and Steiner's tobacco speech marked the birth of "Waldorf" education. It was for "special children," not special because of their social standing but special because they were to enjoy "human

[4] Herbert Hahn, one eyewitness to the event, sketches this scene in "Geburt der Waldorfschule aus dem Impulse der Dreigliederung," [Birth of the Waldorfschool out of the quest for a new social order] (Hahn: 1977, pp. 84 - 85) ; for a report of Hahn's memories as recorded by his friend and Waldorf colleague Johannes Tautz, see Tautz: 1979, pp. 74 - 75.

[5] Unless otherwise noted, translations are the author's own.

[6] Hahn, p. 85

[7] Berta Bull, a Waldorf student enrolled 1923, cites this event in an unpublished letter, May 10, 1995. I am grateful for her help in providing me with essential insights. On the workers' instigation of the Waldorf school idea, see Hahn: 1977, pp.82 - 85.

[8] This proletarian inception has been passed over in the secondary literature, even in the excellent, precise and detailed accounts by Christoph Lindenberg (1988; 1992).

[9] Molt: 1991, p. 137.

education": a wholistic education of body, soul and mind.

Only two days later the "tobacco vision" took form. Significantly, one of those present, Herbert Hahn, called this session "the first faculty meeting." [10] It is important to note that the idea of a school was not Steiner's alone. From the first, the creation of Waldorf was a communal act. In attendance were four members, each a remarkable personality: Molt, Steiner, Hahn, and Karl Stockmeyer. Molt had just offered to fund the school initiative if Steiner agreed to take the lead. Earlier that year he had already introduced education classes for his workers. At the time, Stockmeyer was a high school teacher in Baden, and a disciple of Steiner. Many of you may be familiar with his name since it is attached to the Waldorf curriculum which he outlined after Steiner's death.[11] Since the guns had fallen silent that previous winter (1918), Stockmeyer had become a political pamphleteer for the restoration of German society through education reform .[12] Hahn, another early follower of Steiner, was just back from the western front. He had come to Stuttgart from the barracks specifically to run the new adult education program Molt had initiated. All were struck and moved by the workers' demand for a school.

Never before had the issue been raised of Steiner starting a school. Now for the first time the four explored together how such a school should look. In modern parlance, this was a brainstorming session. We should note what this meeting was not. They did not talk about school structure or curriculum; nor was the issue how to get state approval, teachers' job descriptions or how to recruit a faculty for the new school. None of these matters was even touched upon. The agenda contained only

[10] Tautz, p. 74.
[11] Stockmeyer: 1991.
[12] For an account of Stockmeyer's involvement with the school founding, see the report by his friend and Waldorf colleague Johannes Tautz (Tautz: 1979, pp.47 - 53).

two points: the urgent need for social renewal, and as its vehicle, a new type of education. At stake was what might be called pedagogical socialization or social pedagogy: uppermost in their mind was a new school for a new society.

Steiner laid out the intimate connection between imagination and social interaction. Building on his view of man as having three dimensions, " thinking," "feeling" and "willing," he described the various stages of intensity with which these emerge in individuals. Today's culture has privileged thinking, with positive but also with disastrous effects: "It has made each person more of an individual; but it has also de-socialized people by ripping them out of their social context. By its very nature," he continued, " thinking is anti-social...You can organize the grandest congresses at which people talk profoundly and long about 'the social.' But so long as issues are only discussed intellectually, the yield of such a congress is nil." Worse, such mental exercises will only add to the fragmentation of our social fabric: "To achieve impact we have to reach down into the deeper layers of consciousness, the world of feeling and will."[13] At this central point Steiner placed imagination and, as the key to unlock this imagination, artistic talent Good education, in the sense of total education, he observed, restores the balance between thinking, willing and feeling, thus healing the social fabric.

Steiner proceeded to sketch what this cohesive education would look like for Waldorf factory workers. In their case, restoring the balance and unlocking the artistic meant, in practical terms, that each worker needed to acquire an understanding of his or her complete environment. It would not suffice to make this a matter of generalities about the tobacco firm. Gaining this kind of insight would mean getting a vivid grasp of

[13] Hahn, pp. 87-88.

the precise sequences of production from start to finish. Because the firm functioned in a larger chain of production, "all workers will have to gain an understanding of the tobacco plant, the regions in which it is grown and of the culture of those regions. On the other end, they should gain insight into the modes of distribution, and into the economic and financial processes involved."[14] By gaining this grasp of the whole, everyone's consciousness is expanded. Yet far more is achieved, Steiner concluded: interest in your fellow humans is stimulated and the fragmentation caused by the destructive forces of industrialization is overcome. This vision of a creative education of world citizens guided these four men as they embarked on a four-month whirlwind quest to set up a truly new school.[15]

And they succeeded. Despite the fact that at the time of this meeting there was neither staff nor funding, neither building nor the necessary government approval, Waldorf came to be. Indeed, the school opened with a running start. In September 1919, its doors were opened to receive 253 students. One year later the size of the student body had doubled. By Steiner's death in 1925, enrollment had reached 800,[16] and the school had already become a model to other schools both within and outside of Germany. Foundings in Hamburg (Germany), across the border in

---

[14] Hahn: 1977, p. 89.

[15] Parallels with Jane Addams and John Dewey deserve further investigation. Both worked in another urban center-- not Stuttgart but Chicago-- in the same two decades. On Jane Addams' and John Dewey's desire to give capitalism a human face along lines remarkably similar to what Hahn recounts here, see Jane Addams, Democracy and social ethics (New York, 1902), and Addams, "The subjective necessity for social settlements," in Jane Addams et al.: Philanthropy and social progress (New York, 1893), and John Dewey, School and society (Chicago, 1899). For a critical analysis,see Lawrence A. Cremin, The transformation of the school (New York: 1964); for John Dewey and Jane Addams' desire to give schools a human face, followed by active support in the emergent Chicago school leadership (Ella Flag Young), see David Tyack, The one best system (Cambridge, 1974).

[16] It is noteworthy that this school is still running. September 1989 it celebrated its seventieth birthday. Speeches given at the occasion are collected in Hans-Joachim Mattke's 70 Jahre Freie Waldorfschule Uhlandshoehe, Stuttgart 1919 - 1989 (Stuttgart, 1989). September 1994, the school's seventy-fifth birthday celebration was documented by the same editor, a Stuttgart Waldorf teacher, with a volume recording the reform's global spread (Mattke: 1994).

Dornach (Switzerland) and just outside of London in Kings Langley (England), followed between 1920 and 1923. By 1940, nine Waldorf schools existed in five different lands -- one of them in America. Today, over 600 schools exist in 44 different countries.[17] More than 120 of these are in the United States.

The most remarkable aspect of this rapid and sustained growth[18] has yet to be pointed out: Waldorf has spread without a bureaucracy to guard its purity. There is no government department or school board[19] seeing to it that teachers observe Waldorf rules, perform Christmas plays in December, observe Michaelmas in the fall, or search far and wide for wooden desks with rounded corners.Nor is there an equivalent to the Catholic school system whose organizational structure provides one reason for the Catholic schools' historical endurance, as a recent careful study of Catholic schools concludes.[20]

---

[17] For the chronology of world-wide school foundings, see Raab: 1982,p. 30; for a listing of schools by country, see Nobel: 1991, p.298; for a table of school foundings in the U.S., see AWSNA: 1995 (pamphlet).

[18] There are other initiatives, like the Dalton Plan, who initially profited more from the hunger for innovation. However, while Waldorf's growth was not as fast, it was sustained. The Dalton case, an initiative spear headed by Rudolf Steiner's contemporary Helen Parkhurst, serves to underscore the exceptional staying power of Waldorf. The Dalton Plan, developed in the 1920's, faded away by 1949, as Tyack and Cuban point out, when only one school was still following this method: the Dalton School Parkhurst herself had founded. Moreover, as recorded by researcher Susan Semel in The transformation of a progressive school: The Dalton School (1992), by the mid-1970's the method had disappeared all together, even at the founder's own private school. Ironically, Parkhurst recognized an affinity between her and Steiner's reforms: when she heard Steiner speak at a conference in Oxford, 1922, she was sufficiently impressed with him to offer her academy's building to the fledgling New York school when Dalton sought larger quarters (Brown: April 4, 1929). Yet, while hers was initially far more successful -- by 1930 two percent of America's secondary schools surveyed in a national study reported that they had completely reorganized their schools to conform with the Dalton Plan (Tyack & Cuban, p. 96) while the one and only Waldorf school in the U.S., in New York City, remained a solitary initiative until 1941 -- today there are over 600 Waldorf schools, and no schools based on the Dalton Plan.

[19] See The one best system (1974) wherein David Tyack records the formation of an educational bureaucracy in states and local districts that served to maintain a public school system.

[20] See Bryk, Lee & Holland: 1993.

What is the secret of Waldorf's time-resistant identity?[21] I suggest that it can be found in the unique combination of imagination and social interaction: the crucial foundation of a "free" school. This profile encompassed in 1919, at the reform's birth, two facets to which I must turn now: the external freedom <u>from</u> the government constraints, and the internal freedom <u>for</u> imaginative and innovative faculty interaction.

In this two-fold sense, Waldorf was indeed a "free" school from the beginning. At the time of its founding, freedom "from the state" meant that it was independent from state funding, and largely independent from state supervision. Financially, however, the school was by no means free but -- at least originally --supported by Molt's tobacco money. Also legal compromises had to be made. To achieve the necessary measure of internal freedom, Steiner had to make concessions to the ministry of education.[22] In methodology and didactics, the school was to have a free hand under one condition: that by the end of third grade, sixth grade and ninth grade, students would have covered the same material as their public school counterparts.[23]

---

[21] In their critical review of the last two centuries' reform efforts, <u>Tinkering toward utopia</u> (1995), David Tyack and Larry Cuban argue persuasively that the most "vigorous and imaginative" reforms could not last and had to" fade away," unable to alter what the authors call "the grammar of schooling": the institutional structures that came to define the "widespread cultural beliefs about what constitutes real school" (Tyack & Cuban, p. 88). Tyack and Cuban's analysis accentuates the mystery of Waldorf's staying power. Waldorf challenged institutional norms of the "real school": from its inception, there was no sorting of students according to academic proficiency, nor did the Waldorf school organize the school day into hourly periods, both by the authors' definition constitutive features of "the grammar of schooling" (Tyack & Cuban, pp. 85 - 86). Instead, in the first Waldorf school all students passed as a class from one grade to the next, and the faculty worked with ninety-minute "main lessons" at the beginning of each school day. Though unlike "real school," the characteristic features of this reform have not receded but have been retained.

[22] For Steiner's recounting of the points in which he negotiated freedom for the nascent school, see GA 192; for Stockmeyer's report on the same point, see <u>Nachrichten der Rudolf Steiner Nachlass Verwaltung</u>, Vol. 27, p. 20.

[23] Cf. Gabert: 1968, as quoted in Leber: 1974, p. 67. Steiner makes reference to these compromises on standards in his opening address for the first teacher training (Steiner: 1975; Vol. 1, p. 61) to incite his faculty to keep two goals in view at all times: loyalty to their vision on the one hand, and flexibility in light of the very real situational constraints on the other.

Significantly, in this compromise Steiner was agreeing to what we would today call "performance and subject-matter standards." In return for this adjustment to the standards of the public education system, the school secured independence in three crucial areas: curriculum, instruction and school governance. The school was granted absolute freedom to structure its lessons and determine what subjects it taught. Furthermore, it was given the permission to hire its own teachers -- disregarding state certification -- and to design its own teacher training. Last but not least, the school was given the freedom to be faculty-run -- a school design that had no precedent in Germany at the turn of the century. [24]

With this external frame in place, the pedagogical content had to be filled in. Indeed, everything still had to be spelled out: curriculum, lesson structure, and subject matter, and especially "the art of education." It is significant to note that Steiner and Molt could very well have drawn up the lesson plans and then hired the teachers to follow them. They acted quite differently. A faculty was hired to be

[24] In the history of German school reform , Steiner was by no means the first to envision a faculty-run school. But outside of parochial-school networks, the Waldorf school was the first free school to be implemented . Formative for the Waldorf effort were the political passions concerning state and free schools that had come to run deeply by the time of the founding. At the end of the eighteenth century. Prussia had declared education to be a responsibility of the state (1794). But the matter did not go uncontested. Already 1810 the reformer J.F.Herbart (1776-1841) criticized the education monopoly of the state ("Ueber Erziehung unter oeffentlicher Mitwirkung" [About education under state governance] reprinted in Berg: 1980, pp. 37-45). In the wake of the revolution of 1848, the policy maker Lorenz von Stein proposed that schools be run by governance bodies formed from any one of three constituencies: the local community; the community, church and teachers; or the teachers themselves (1868; in Kloss: 1979, pp. 44). In the years immediately following the Revolution, over 100 publications appeared questioning the structure of the Prussian educational system. When 1871 Bismarck saw to it that this principle was incorporated in imperial law, such voices of criticism reemerged, now directed at the national level (see Mueller: 1978, p. 17). Throughout the last decades of the previous century, voices for self-government of schools were raised, for education free from all political and economic dependencies, to be organized as free associations ["Genossenschaft"]. At the turn of the century, Paul Natorp called for total independence of the school from the state, both politically and economically (quoted in Ruhloff: 1966, p. 140); Ellen Key, Berthold Otto, Gustav Wyneken argued along similar lines (quoted by W. Mueller: 1978, p. 19 as cited in Leber: 1974, pp. 34 -41). Waldorf's insistence on being a "free school" was therefore not an innovation. Through the unusual revolutionary circumstances, Steiner's ideas combined with Molt's support and funding, and the support of key players in policy circles such as Heymann to be realized. Its novelty was that now this free school was truly practiced, not just debated.

"Waldorf trained," and to do the work of formulating Waldorf practice together. Thus, from August 20 to September 5 , 1919, a select group of teachers met with Steiner, Molt, Hahn and Stockmeyer to articulate these fundamentals. Those three weeks in the summer of 1919 marked a tour-de-force in institution creation. On the opening night, Steiner laid out the principles of governance : the school was to be faculty-run. Steiner insisted on what he called a "republican" foundation of the community:[25] the relationship among the teachers had to be that of equals. In the ensuing weeks, Steiner designed and directed the training course, presenting his approach to the growing child and a curriculum geared toward its development in each phase.

Until this present day, whether in Stuttgart (Germany), The Hague (Holland), or Sacramento (California), these August 1919 lectures form the canon of any Waldorf teacher training program.[26] However, though detailed and in-depth on the nature of the child and how he best learns, these talks outlined only Steiner's general principles: the rest was up to the teachers. Over the years they developed on this basis the Waldorf "style" of teaching. This dearth of guidance raises the question, why the school's identity was not deluded by diversity but developed such a recognizable program that a clear pedagogy could be transmitted. How were the teachers working together to harvest such yield?

Fortunately, careful minutes were kept of the first 70 faculty meetings attended but not controlled by Steiner.[27] These show how the faculty operated -- struggling and negotiating to develop structures and curriculum. The teachers decided that they needed weekly meetings to discuss pedagogical issues, so that what each had

[25] Steiner: 1975;Vol. 1, p. 62.
[26] See Steiner, GA 293;1981/1919; 1988/1919.
[27] Steiner: 1975; Vols. 1 - 3.

discovered would benefit all. It is important to emphasize that this definitive characteristic of Waldorf -- the weekly faculty meeting -- was not initiated by Steiner but by the teachers. It was even voted in by the faculty, in Steiner's absence.[28] Steiner"s inspiration is beyond doubt, yet Waldorf was far more than the creation of one lonely leader.

In the Waldorf republic, a structure without hierarchy was not a goal in itself. Steiner's point was that organization and pedagogical content be recognized as inseparable. The teachers, constantly confronted with "lonely" decisions in their separate classrooms, thus participated in a"joint venture." In the founder's own words, their collective goal was to secure "collegial responsibility for the pedagogy of the school as a whole."[29] The outcome of this continual effort to translate theory into practice and practice into commonly respected pedagogical guidelines was not a foregone conclusion. As the minutes reveal, the founding faculty had to address two dangers lurking in the novel structure of a teacher-directed school. The first was that teachers might only follow their own views, so that the common front would disintegrate. The second was the sacrifice of the teachers' essential independence on the altar of "group think."[30] If this republic was to function, each teacher who invariably brought along different assumptions and goals had to be prepared to truly reflect with

[28] For the first recorded suggestion of a plan for weekly teacher meetings, see Rudolf Steiner: 1975, Vol. 1, p. 83. It stands to reason that the proposal was made in anticipation of Steiner's impending departure from Stuttgart. Steiner left five days after this meeting, not to return to the school until the following December (Cf. Lindenberg: 1988, pp. 421 - 423). In the absence of the founder, the teachers were under pressure to create together structures for running the school.

[29] Steiner: 1975; Vol. 1, p. 62.

[30] Policy analyst and teacher educator Michael Fullan reflects this concern in his analysis of today's site-based management efforts: "The dark side of groupthink is not just a'matter of avoiding the dangers of over-conformity. Under conditions of dynamic complexity different points of view often anticipate new problems earlier than do like-minded close-knit groups" (Fullan: 1994, p. 35). For further contemporary parallels to the Waldorf concern with t the tension between a faculty member's independence and collective action, see the work of Hargreaves & Fullan (1991), Rosenholtz (1989), Storr (1988), Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin (1996), Stokes & McLaughlin (forthcoming) and McLaughlin & Talbert (forthcoming).

his colleagues. The teacher meetings became, as they had to become, the locus for constant collective deliberation.

Precisely in this republican vision, Waldorf was most revolutionary, and here we touch upon the secret of its vitality. Such trust in the "commune" of teachers differed sharply from existing models of reform. As Steiner put it, "democracy always contains the ferment of one's own downfall if it does not at the same time contain the seed of true respect for the other." [31] The very choice of words reveals not only the repudiation of Prussian hierarchical values but also the rejection of the widespread Nietzschean disdain for democracy as the tyranny by the untutored majority. Instead, Steiner trusted democracy-in-education by entrusting it to the cohesive power of imagination.

This enormous advance in thinking about teacher community should not blind us to three Waldorf liabilities. First, the social interaction model of "Stuttgart 1919" itself is a liability. "Teachers can't innovate when they are constantly obsessed with the miracle of the founding of a free school in Stuttgart," as one Amsterdam Waldorf teacher put it.[32] When canonized, the once "free" pedagogy is packaged together with time bound preconceptions of Stuttgart at the beginning of the century. Yesterday's sacred innovation is bound to become tomorrow's servile imitation. Secondly, the original German curricular canon poses a liability. Today Waldorf teachers are being challenged by voices from inside[33] and outside[34] the Waldorf community to abandon nineteenth-century definitions of "culture" in such doctrines as the indispensability of Norse myths, the uniqueness of Charlemagne's empire or the timelessness of Wolfram von Eschenbach's Parcival. A third liability is specific to the United States:

[31] Steiner: GA 333, p, 222.
[32] Seelen, as quoted in Duijverstijn: 1997, p. 19.
[33] Staley: 1996; Williams: 1994.
[34] Byers, et al.: 1996; Dillard: 1996; McDermott: 1992.

the ideal of "freedom from the Prussian state" can easily be put in the service of the voucher drive for "freedom from the community." In their desire to protect Waldorf purity, its champions lend credence to the myth that Waldorf is a "special philsophy" for "special children." It is important to realize that this position is based on a misreading of Steiner, who saw the need to target society at large and to function within the setting of the state. He worked hard to gain wavers from the government to secure freedom of instruction and organization within the school. Yet, Steiner was fully prepared to sign an agreement with the government on common standards. This point is overlooked by crusaders against public Waldorf initiatives, anxious to preserve Waldorf orthodoxy.[35]

What qualities, then, have enabled Waldorf to retain its character and maintain its vitality? Herbert Hahn, that teacher of the first hour on the occasion of celebrating fifty years of Waldorf highlighted two: courage and intuition, which marked the founding of the school. Steiner had the courage to act socially and had the imaginative intuition to envision a unique school form. His founding faculty followed in his footsteps. This combination of courage and intuition has to be maintained in order to retain vitality. As Hahn put it, the alternative is stagnation. [36]

In Waldorf schools today, we witness daily examples of such imaginative vitality. The imagination to deal creatively with one another informs faculty team work.[37] It also frames the work of teachers with students.[38] The teacher is to stay with his class of students for eight years: thus, he can learn to imagine the child better, and both student and teacher can develop a history of interaction. To achieve this goal,

[35] Kobran & Lamb: 1996; Lamb: 1996; 1994.
[36] Hahn: 1969.
[37] Easton: 1995.
[38] Nobel: 1996; Uhrmacher: 1993a; 1993b.

narratives are central. [39] In his tales, the teacher imagines with the student; student and teacher become equal partners in the democratic arena of imagining the story.[40] The respect for the other hinges on a respect for oneself. In such embattled terrains as urban America today it is especially important that children are invited to imagine themselves as kings and queens with their regal colleagues in the classroom beside them.[41]

Liberated from its German turn-of-the-century jetsam, Waldorf can become an important allay in guiding American teachers to meet the growing challenge of education today. Provided these three liabilities are clearly identified and successfully avoided, Waldorf has the potential to make a substantial contribution to schooling in this country, not for "special" children but for all.

[39] As child psychologist David Elkind remarked, Waldorf teachers recognize that "we are a storytelling and a story-loving species." Elkind: 1997, p. 9.
[40] Armon: 1997; Golden: 1997.
[41] Dillard: 1996.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addams, J. et al. (Eds.). (1893). Philanthropy and social progress. New York.

Addams, J. (1964). Democracy and social ethics. Scott, A. F. (Ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Armon, J. (March 1997). The Waldorf curriculum as a framework for moral education: One dimension of a fourfold system. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Association of Waldorf Schools of North America (AWSNA) (1995). The spread of Waldorf schools. Fair Oaks: AWSNA.

Berg, C. (Ed.). (1980). Staat und Schule oder Staatschule: Stellungnahmen von Paedagogen und Schulpolitikern zu einem unerledigten Problem; 1789 - 1889. Koenigstein.

Brown, I. (April 5, 1929). Personal letter. Unpublished.

Bryck, A., Lee, V., & Holland, P. 1993. Catholic schools and the common good. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bull, B. (May 10, 1995). Personal letter. Unpublished.

Byers, P., Dillard, C, Easton, F., Henry, M, McDermott, R., Oberman, I., Uhrmacher, B, (1996). Waldorf education in an inner city public school: The urban Waldorf school of Milwaukee. Spring Valley: Parker Courney Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. & McLaughlin, M. (1996). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. In McLaughlin, M. & Oberman, I. (Eds.), Teacher learning: New policies, new practices, pp. 202 - 218. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1899). The school and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dillard, C. (Fall/Winter 1996). The Urban Waldorf School and the African American child. Renewal, 37-40.

Duijverstijn, J. (February 7, 1997). Vrije school: Wet van de remmende voorsprong? Jonas 12, 16-19.

Easton, F. (1995). The Waldorf impulse in education: Schools as communities that educate the whole child by integrating artistic and academic work. Ph.D.dissertation. Teachers College.

Elkind, D. (Spring-Summer 1997). Waldorf education in the postmodern world. Renewal (6) 1, 5 - 9.

Fine. M. (1996). Imagination, critique, and social action: So what's research got to do with it? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change Forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. Falmer Press: London.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for in your school? Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Gabert, E. (1968). Einleitung. Hinweise zu den Konferenzen Rudolf Steiners mit den Lehrer der freien Waldorfschule in Stuttgart, 1919 - 1924. Unpublished manuscript.

Golden, J. (1997). The use of story in Waldorf education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Hahn, H. (August/September 1969). Mut und Intuition: Worauf es bei der Gruendung der Waldorfschule ankam [Courage and intuition: The essential factors in the Waldorf school's founding]. Erziehungskunst: Monatschrift zur Paedagogik Rudolf Steiners, 33 (8/9), 329 - 336.

Husemann, G & Tautz (Eds.) (1977). Der Lehrerkreis um Rudolf Steiner in der ersten Waldorfschule 1919-1925. Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben.

Hahn, H. (1967). Die Geburt der Waldorfschule aus den Impulsen der Dreigliederung [The birth of the Waldorfschool out of the impulse for a new social order]. In Krueck v. Poturzyn, M.J. (Ed.), Wir erlebten Rudolf Steiner: Erinnerungen seiner Schueler. [We experienced Rudolf Steiner: Reflections of his students] (pp. 70 - 100). Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben.

Kobran, J. & Lamb, G. (Summer-Fall 1996) We're not always right, but close enough. The Threefold Review, 14, 1 - 3.

Kloss, H. (1983). Selbstverwaltung und die Dreigleiderung des sozialen Organismus. Frankfurt a.M.

Lamb, G. (Summer/Fall 1996). The esoteric basis of the threefold social order and the mission of Waldorf education. The Threefold Review 14, 12 - 23.

Lamb, G. (Fall/Winter 1994). Public Waldorf schools: Cultural advance or cultural suicide? Renewal, 22 - 26.

Leber, S. (1974). Die Sozialgestalt der Waldorfschule [The Waldorf school's social profile]. Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben.

Lindenberg, C. (1993). Rudolf Steiner , Hamburg: Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.

Lindenberg, C. (1988). Rudolf Steiner: Eine Chronik: 1861 - 1925 [A chronicle of the life of Rudolf Steiner]. Stuttgart: Verlag Freies Geistesleben.

McDermott, R. (1992). "Waldorf in America: Problems and promises." ReVision 15, 82 - 90.

McLaughlin, M. & Talbert, J. (forthcoming) Schoolteaching in context. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Molt, C. (1991). Emil Molt and the beginnings of the Waldorf School. Edinburgh: Floris Books.

Mueller, H. (1978). Zur Geschichte radikaler Schulkritik in der juengeren Vergangenheit. In Fischer, W. (Ed.), Schule als parapaedagogsche Organization, pp. 9 - 24. Kastelaun.

Nachrichten der Rudolf Steiner-Nachlassverwaltung [News updates of the Rudolf Steiner estate]. (1969). Das Jahr der Dreigliederungsbewegung und die Gruendung der Waldorfschule. Vols. 27 - 28. Dornach

Nobel, A. (1996). Educating through art: The Steiner school approach. Edinburgh: Floris Books.

Rosenholtz, S. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Ruhloff, J. (1966). Gedanken zum Verhaeltniss von Schule und Staat in der Paedagogik Paul Natorp. Vierteljahresschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Paedagogik, Vol.

Semel, S.F. (1992). The transformation of a progressive school: The Dalton School New York: Peter Lang.

Staley, B. (1996). Hear the voice of the Griot! A guide to African geography, history and culture. Fair Oaks: Rudolf Steiner College Press.

Steiner, R. (1955 - 1996). Rudolf Steiner Gesamtausgabe. (abbreviated as GA) [Collected edition o f Steiner's complete works]. Rudolf Steiner Verlag: Dornach.

-- (1975). Konferenzen mit den Lehrern der Freien Waldorfschule in Stuttgart 1919 bis 1924. [Faculty meetings at the Waldorfschool Stuttgart]. Vols 1 - 3. Rudolf Steiner Verlag: Dornach. (GA 300/1 - 300/3).

-- (1981/1919) The study of man. London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (GA 293).

-- (1988/1919) Practical advice to teachers. London: Rudolf Steiner Press. (GA 301).

-- (1994/1919) A social basis for primary and secondary education. Forest Row: Steiner Schools Fellowship (GA 192).

Stockmeyer, K. 1991. Rudolf Steiner's curriculum for Waldorf Schools. Forest Row: Steiner School Fellowship Publication.

Stokes, L. & McLaughlin, M. (forthcoming) Mind-set matters: Cultivating a learning-centered school. Stanford University.

Tautz, J. (1979). Ernst Stockmeyer. In Husemann, G. (Ed.), Der Lehrerkreis um Rudolf Steiner in der ersten Waldorfschule, pp. 47 - 53. Verlag Freies Geistesleben: Stuttgart.

Tautz, J. (1979). Herbert Hahn. In Husemann, G. (Ed.), Der Lehrerkreis um Rudolf Steiner in der ersten Waldorfschule, pp. 71 - 77. Verlag Freies Geistesleben: Stuttgart.

Tyack, D. (1974). The one best system. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tyack, D. & Cuban, L. 1995. Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Uhrmacher, P.B. (1993a). Coming to know the world through Waldorf education. Journal of curriculum and supervision, 9 (1), 87 - 104.

Uhrmacher, P.B. (1993b). Making contact: An exploration of focused attention between teacher and students. Curriculum Inquiry, 23 (4), 433 - 444.

Williams, L. (Spring/Summer 1994). Multiculturalism and Waldorf education: A call for an American curriculum. Renewal 29-32.

Abbreviations used.

GA 1955 - present.....Rudolf Steiner Gesamtausgabe. [Rudolf Steiner's collected works]. Edited in Dornach. I cite according to volume number (=GA).